CITATION AND PRESENTATION OF THE ACADEMY MEDAL* TO F. PEYTON ROUS, M.D.

C. P. RHOADS

Director, the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, New York, N. Y.

As YEARS pass it becomes more frequently in order for the somewhat younger individual to speak publicly, in tribute to a somewhat older one. To perform this function a pupil of the senior is usually selected, or at least one who has some direct scientific or other reason to be indebted to the recipient of the honor. To discharge his duties properly, moreover, the payer of tribute is expected to bring forward some unique twist of phrase which will distinguish or make memorable his comment.

Until recently I have never had the honor of working with Peyton Rous, and I have no gift of words adequate to discharge properly my responsibility on this occasion. My contact with this man has been, however, of such a peculiar, and to me inspiring, nature as to lead me to acquiesce with the suggestion that I refer to it publicly, in tribute to this notable recipient of the Academy Medal.

Since it is usual and useful to refer to biographical matters, I would remind you that Dr. Rous was graduated from Johns Hopkins University in 1900, and received his medical degree in 1905. He interned at the Hopkins Hospital in medicine, became interested in pathology and continued this interest at Michigan. He was called to the Rockefeller Institute in 1909 and has been there, and a leader there, since that time.

Recall, if you will, the role of Hopkins in the revolution in medical teaching and research under way then, the inspiration given to younger men by its very great faculty, and its unique point of view.

The problem of the control of cancer disease mounts steadily

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of The New York Academy of Medicine, January 8, 1959.

F. PEYTON ROUS, M.D.

in importance. The major steps toward its solution have been made by a relatively small number of individuals. Among these Peyton Rous was, in 1911, one of the first. Our modern knowledge of the neoplastic process has been constructed to a large extent around his contributions.

His original demonstration of the cell-free transmission of fowl neoplasms was complete, and at the same time revolutionary. It remained a storm center of discussion among workers in cancer research for forty years. Its significance for an understanding of cancer has been fully appreciated only recently. This work remains a landmark not only in the field of its direct application, but also in virology as a whole.

But Peyton Rous saw beyond the circumscribed area of a single technique. When its possibilities were temporarily exhausted by the limited knowledge of the time, he turned, with similar skill, to other fields.

Modern hematology, replete with knowledge and procedures, gives little hint of how mysterious were the mechanisms of blood generation and destruction thirty years ago. Transfusion was a major surgical undertaking. The preservation of blood was inconceivable, its destruction little understood, and its production a mystery. "Anemia" was a diagnosis almost as useless as "fever" had been before our knowledge of the bacterial etiology of disease. Peyton Rous and his associates went far to illuminate these biological recesses.

Immunology was also the gainer by his work. New knowledge of the source of antibodies was made available. The discovery of hydrocarbon carcinogens and of a virus-induced cancer of the mammal by Shope brought additional new tools to hand. The complementary actions of the carcinogens and tumor viruses became a major step forward in cancer research. It contributed much to our thinking on hidden or latent viruses that may spring into action under some apparently unrelated stimulus.

I have recounted, perhaps inadequately, some part of the formal record. May I now refer to a more personal and largely unrecorded aspect of his work. This was his contact with and influence on younger men.

As a young pathologist just entering the field of investigative medicine, I had early contact with Dr. Rous in his capacity as editor of the *Journal of Experimental Medicine*. I am afraid that I was a brash young man at the time, distinctly overestimating the importance of the manu-

script I had submitted. In retrospect, this was not surprising since the work had no value whatever.

Dr. Rous, gravely and patiently, reviewed my efforts with me, demolished my conclusions, refuted my claims and made clear the proper use of my native tongue. He then rebuilt on the ruins such a clear picture of the problem, and the procedure required to solve it, that my conceit was converted almost imperceptibly to inspiration, my enthusiasm to resolution. As I left the generous, patient, and kindly man, I was no longer the same individual. I was, however, wholly convinced that if I worked very assiduously, with the greatest vigor, for a very long time, perhaps I could make a real contribution.

Nothing, please be assured, could have turned me then from a life in medical science.

And realize, if you will, that the world of medical research is now strongly influenced by many, many individuals, much more deserving than I, who chose that career because of Dr. Rous' unique capacity for making inspiration stick and become an irrevocable resolution.

May I then, express my deep feeling and that of many others by the following words in appreciation of Dr. Peyton Rous:

DETERMINATION WITHOUT DOGMATISM
CONSISTENCY WITH CONSIDERATION
WISDOM WITH GENEROSITY
A MOST BELOVED PHYSICIAN
TO WHOM SCIENCE OWES SO MUCH
TO WHOM THE CHARACTER OF SCIENTISTS OWES MORE

And may I then, Peyton, present to you the Medal of The New York Academy of Medicine, a small recognition of what you have meant to so many.